DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 683 EA 012 744

AUTHOR Chafel, Judith A.
TITLE A Time Analysis Study of the Job of the Elementary Principal.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Elementary Education; *Principals; *Research Methodology
IDENTIFIERS *Time and Motion Studies; Time Utilization

ABSTRACT

The author describes the methodology to be used in a time and motion analysis of ten elementary principals, planned for completion at some future date. This research is intended to answer questions concerning the nature of changes in the activities of principals given the increasing pressures from government, community, faculty, and others in recent years. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189683

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Time Analysis Study of the Job of the Elementary Principal

Judith A. Chafel

Indiana University, Bloomington

EA 012 744

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Chafel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Time Analysis Study of the Job

of the Elementary Principal

> ...to turn a Socratic statement to our use... "the unexamined administrator's life is not worth living...."
> Keith Goldhammer, National Elementary Principal (53, no. 3 [1974], p. 31)

A growing body of evidence (Bogue 1969; Booth and Biztray 1970; Breenbough 1969; Houts 1975; Myers 1974) suggests that the individual school setting and the larger school system exert a powerful and pervasive influence over the elementary principal's behavior. Indeed, the principal is the only person within the school structure who faces both inward toward his* own school and outward toward the school system and larger society. Some say (Wiggins 1972) that influences from these sources tend to neutralize the principal's individuality as a leader, resulting in a certain degree of value compliance to what is expected. Compliance is the process whereby a principal's role performance is brought into line with certain constraints that serve to shape his behavior.

Given this view, one would expect that certain changes in the character of the principalship would accompany the deep-seated and ubiquitous changes occurring in American society and its schools over the last decade. This is plausible since the role definition for most principals has traditionally been somewhat ambiguous.

---

*The generic he will be used in this paper since the majority of elementary principals are, in fact, men.

A number of writers aver or suggest that principals have unclear and all too often conflicting expectations and understandings of what their role should be. Kuralt, for example, claims that "boards of education haven't always been clear about the qualifications they wanted in a principal" (cited by McNally 1974, p. 7). A recent study funded by the USOE states that

> . . .perceptions of the principal, which predominate in the minds of faculty members, may fluctuate between instructional leader, business manager, curriculum director, bureaucrat, representative of the superintendent, or representative of the faculty (USOE 1971, p. 34).

Finally, McNally (1974) observes that community members and school superintendents have varied perceptions of what principals are for, what they do, and what they should and should not do.

Over the last decade, a variety of forces, both societal and organizational, have tended to act upon the principalship. The first development has been the increasing bureaucratization of almost every structure and institution in our society, including the educational system. The enlargement of school districts resulting from increasing urbanization and district reorganization has had a profound influence on the nature of school administration. As a consequence, Houts (1975) notes that principals have felt inundated with "administrivia" and managerial tasks that have detracted from their role as an educational leader. Superintendents expect principals to get their forms in on time, keep the building clean, and stick to routines. In this sense, superintendents do not see principals as educational leaders, but rather as subordinate members of the bureaucracy and, in fact, as middle management employees.

Principals realize that in all too many cases their performance will be evaluated on the basis of how well they attend to these managerial chores. For this reason, it would be unwise to ignore the effect of role expectations such as these on the behavior of the principal.

Secondly, schools have become as much social service agencies as educational ones. We expect our schools to provide food services, health care, and recreational activities for the community, not to mention an elaborate transportation system. The principal works within the constraints of a system of formalized, mandated procedures to execute these functions.

Furthermore, the principal is constrained by the national character of the educational system. As Campbell (1965) points out,

> . . .we have always had some federal policy for education. . .in recent decades this policy has grown appreciably, and. . .all evidence suggests that more national policy is inevitable (p. 46).

A recent study by the Association of California School Administrators (n.d.) reports that the increase in federal categorical aid programs in the last ten years is equal to the preceding fifty years. As principals act to implement these programs (Title V Desegregation, AB 1329 Bilingual Education, PL 94-142 and Title 45 Regular and Special Education for the Handicapped), they have less and less time to be instructional leaders. More and more time is spent processing paperwork resulting from federal, state and local requirements.

Another phenomenon has been the growth in the number of specialists of many kinds in the schools accelerated by the advent of differentiated staffing. This trend is more likely to increase than to abate for today's

society is one of specialization. The resulting community of the school demands considerably more coordinating skill on the part of the principal to harmonize these specialists in a smooth, concerted way. Mazzarella (1976) notes that writers such as Johnson, Logsdon and Wiegman, Peterson, Templeton, Mattaliano and Barth all surmise that the principal will be increasingly called upon to serve a coordinating function.

In addition, McNally (1974) remarks that over the years we have witnessed the rapid-fire emergence of a series of educational innovations. As a consequence, principals have been pressured to install one or more of such plans as IPI, IGE, MBO, team teaching or multi-unit plans, differentiated staffing, SMSG, the "Inquiry Curriculum," etc., and many more that are too numerous to mention here. All of these responsibilities are compounded by a rising volume of demands for accountability requiring reams and hours of paperwork for the principal.

A sixth development has been the initiation of collective bargaining, its subsequent growth and now widespread prevalence. The unionization of teachers has had at least one direct and adverse effect upon the principalship. Principals have found themselves complying with the numerous provisions of contracts negotiated between teachers and school boards (more often than not, with little or no input from them). Along with the expectation for compliance by the principal has come a possible curtailment (depending upon the nature of the negotiated contract) of their supervisory functions in such areas as teachers' evaluation and in-service training.

Finally, Coleman (1972) argues that current trends toward increased competence and professionalization of teachers, toward specialization of

function and toward emphasis on authority of knowledge or expertise seem likely to make the notion of the principal as educational leader less viable. The tendency toward higher levels of training among teachers (presumably, accompanied by increased competence) is shown by the increased percentage of teachers holding advanced degrees. This trend suggests that it may be increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for the prircipal to know as much as his teaching staff about their respective fields of proficiency. Consequently, he may be ill-qualified in many respects to advise or evaluate them. Thus the principal may be barred from functioning as an instructional leader by lack of knowledge.

Considered together, these factors (societal and organizational) suggest severe constraints upon the actions and decision-making power of today's principal. Yet, we have relatively little hard data on the actual functioning of elementary principals. There are few objectively validated, factual descriptions from which we can generalize about the operation and effects of factors, such as the above, that influence, and may even determine, the administrative behavior of the principal. Thus the specific research question posed for study is: Are principals decreasing their emphasis on instructional program leadership and increasing the time and attention they give to managerial tasks?

Methodology

To investigate the research question of the study, a time-motion analysis describing the tasks principals perform during their routine daily functioning will be made.

Subjects. A sample of ten elementary principals (thus representing a 5.4% sample of the accessible population) will be drawn from all elementary school principals in the Austin Independent School District. Selection will be based solely on the criteria of experience (a minimum of 5 years), location in the district, school size, and willingness to participate in the study. Biographical data will be collected on the principals as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Principals in AISD
Participating in Time Analysis Study

	Sex	Years' Experience	Highest Degree Earned
School 1.			
School 2.			
School 3.			
School 4.			
School 5.			
School 6.			
School 7.			
School 8.			
School 9.			
School 10.			

Austin Independent School District. Fifty-four elementary schools, 6 sixth grade centers, 11 junior high schools, and 9 senior high schools having a combined student population of approximately 57,809 persons comprise the Austin Independent School District. According to 1976 U.S.

Census Bureau Figures the city ranks 78th in size among the major cities of the United States with a population of 308,952. Information to be collected on the 10 schools in the district under study is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Schools in AISD
Participating in Time Analysis Study

	School Size by Enrollment	Teaching Staff Size	Grades	SES Composition of Children Enrolled
School 1.				
School 2.				
School 3.				
School 4.				
School 5.				
School 6.				
School 7.				
School 8.				
School 9.				
School 10.				

Procedures. The analysis of the principals' time will be made from gross activity reports submitted by each principal. A variety of days (eg. five days) will be selected as log-keeping days during a single month (eg. February). An effort will be made to obtain a small sample of days that will be representative of the bulk of the school year. On the basis of the principals' assessment, the time sampled will be verified as representing a typical day with few interruptions in the daily routines. To

reduce the tendency toward activity distortion on the selected days, log-keeping days will be announced in advance. Except for being required to keep a record of everything they do, each principal will be instructed to behave as he would ordinarily. The activity forms are expected to yield a clear and precise picture of the principals' ways of working. A simple diary form that lends itself to an infinite number of analyses will be used. The diary is composed of several columns on a sheet of paper. As many sheets, as required, may be used. The column headings are shown in Figure 1.

Data Analysis. The data consists of the total number of minutes (converted to percentages) engaged in certain categories of activities by the principals. Since the time utilized for each activity will be entered in the logs by the principals, the minutes involved in the various task entries can be estimated. A content analysis of the activity descriptions contained in the logs will be made for three of the "most typical" days.

The Functional Areas of Responsibility developed and validated by Project ROME (n.d.) will be used as a behavioral classification scheme. The Seven Functional Areas of Responsibility comprising the principal's job in the school, as delineated by Project ROME, are as follows:

1. Curriculum and Instruction
2. Staff Personnel
3. Student Personnel
4. Support Management
5. School-Community Interface
6. Fiscal Management
7. System-Wide Policies and Operations

Figure 1
Daily Diary Form

Sample Entry

Name: _____ Date: _____

School: _____

Amount of Time Involved (minutes)*	Time Activity Begins	Ends	Location of the Activity	Description of Events (What? With Whom? How? Results? What Purpose?)	Coding*
	9:50 to	10:50 A.M.	office	Spoke with parent of boy in sixth grade. Mother wanted to know why her son was failing in reading.	

*These spaces will be left blank by the principals. The blank spaces will later be used to categorize the activity along with the amount of time (in minutes) involved.

(See Appendix for a listing of the Functional Areas of Responsibility along with conceptual examples of each.)

Several major areas defining a principal's job in the school were found by the Project ROME staff to be re-occurring in the professional literature on competency-based educational administration. They synthesized the existing statements and designated seven areas as being most frequently emphasized. These became the basis of the ROME Competency Classification Model (RCCM). The model (consisting of task competency statements) was subsequently field-tested in approximately 45 schools in Georgia, and "verified" by school principals and college and university faculty as being frequently important for the effective operation of a school system.

"Miscellaneous" and "Unclassifiable" categories will be added to the analysis scheme to account for incomplete descriptions which may be entered by the principals or time lapses in which no activity is recorded. Principal performances representing interactions which are not classifiable due to incomplete descriptions (eg. "received a telephone call") will be categorized as amounts of time spent performing "miscellaneous" activities. Time periods for which no specific performance description is given (eg. "at the lunchroom") will be classified as "unclassifiable" units of time.

Two persons trained in the field of educational administration, working separately, will judge under which functional area each of the entries fits. All entries on which there is less than 75% agreement will be excluded from the study.

Findings

The data will be described and presented as indicated by the table below.

Table 3: Summary of Time Utilization by Major Functional Areas: Three Sample Days

Major Functional Area	Total Minutes Spent	% of Total Time Spent
A. Curriculum and Instruction		
B. Staff Personnel		
C. Student Personnel		
D. Support Management		
E. School-Community Interface		
F. Fiscal Management		
G. System-Wide Policies and Operations		
Total		

Table 4 represents the opinions of the ten principals on how their time should be spent ideally. These opinions will be sampled after all the diary forms are completed and before the results shown in column "A" are made known. Each column represents a hundred percent of the principals' time.

Discussion

A content analysis using the seven functional areas of responsibility provides a way of viewing the time spent by the principals on different aspects of the total school operation. Using the diary forms with content codings for the amount of time spent in each category, it is

Table 4: Summary of Actual and Ideal
Time Utilization of Principals by Major Functional Areas

Major Functional Area	Percent of Time	
	Actual A	Ideal B
A. Curriculum and Instruction		
B. Staff Personnel		
C. Student Personnel		
D. Support Management		
E. School-Community Interface		
F. Fiscal Management		
G. System-Wide Policies and Operations		
Total		

possible to contrast the data of this study with several other time studies on the elementary principal. While the data of the different studies may not be exactly comparable, they do provide a reasonable basis for comparison to answer the research question of the present study: Are principals decreasing their emphasis on instructional program leadership and increasing the time and attention they give to managerial tasks?

A few studies have been conducted on the amount of time principals spend on various task areas and their estimates of how they would like to distribute their time. The most comprehensive report is a set of nation-wide surveys made by the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association in 1928, 1948, 1958 and 1968. Table 5 summarizes the results of these studies.

Using a questionnaire, the principals surveyed by the DESP estimated the division of their time for one typical school day (1928), year (1948) or school week (1958 and 1968). Only the 1928 survey reports the distribution of the principals' time broken down by both city and school-size. The data indicate that these variables may be important factors. Table 5 presents the data for the group designated each year as being supervising principals. The principals surveyed spent 30.2 percent of their time on administration in 1928; 29.3 percent in 1948; 30.0 percent in 1958; and 30.0 percent in 1968. The amount of time devoted to supervision was 33.8 percent in 1928; 30.9 percent in 1948; 35.0 percent in 1958; and 38.0 percent in 1968. Clerical work enjoyed 18.3 percent of the principals' time in 1928; 15.1 percent in 1948; 14.0 percent in 1958; and 14.0 percent in 1968. The amount of time they gave to teaching was 4.3 percent in 1928; 2.3 percent in 1948; 3.0 percent in 1958; and 4.0 percent in 1968. Other

Table 5: Percent of Time That Supervising Principals Devoted to Major Functions in Survey Years*

Function	1928		1948		1958		1968	
	Actual	Ideal	Actual	Ideal	Actual	Ideal	Actual	Ideal
A. Administration	30.2	25.0	29.3	24.2	30.0	25.0	30.0	24.0
B. Supervision	33.8	51.2	38.9	54.6	35.0	49.0	38.0	53.0
C. Clerical Work	18.3	5.9	15.1	3.5	14.0	4.0	14.0	4.0
D. Teaching	4.3	5.7	2.3	2.6	3.0	2.0	4.0	4.0
E. Other Functions (community work, self-improvement activities, etc.)	13.4	11.8	14.4	15.1	18.0	20.0	13.0	16.0
Total**	100.0%	99.6%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.0%	101.0%

Source: The Elementary School Principalship (1928, 1948, 1958, 1968), Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association.

*In every survey since 1928, the principals made estimates of the proportion of their time devoted to the major functions. It is surprising, in view of this method of collecting the data, that the averages of the estimates have maintained considerable consistency from decade to decade.

In the 1928 and 1948 surveys, a supervisory principal was defined as having more than 75% of his time free from teaching duties and a teaching principal was one with less than 75% of his time free from assigned classroom work. The 1958 survey, in contrast, drew the line at 50%. Respondents to the 1968 survey classified themselves as belonging to one or the other category.

**Columns do not total 100 percent because the numbers have been rounded off.

Functions (such as community work, self-improvement activities, etc.) were allotted 13.4 percent of the principals' time in 1928; 14.4 percent in 1948; 18.0 percent in 1958; and 13.0 percent in 1968.

From Table 5, it appears that on the whole, over the course of the forty years up to 1968, there is evidence of only a slight shift in the relationship of time spent on performing the major functions of the principalship. The principals have tended to hold constant the amount of time they give to administration. They seem to have succeeded in making some small gains in reducing the relative amount of time they give to clerical work. The percent of time given to supervision has varied over the years from 33.8 percent (1928) to 38.0 percent (1968) with a high of 38.9 percent being recorded in 1948. The shift in the amount of time devoted to teaching functions may well reflect the varying definitions assigned to "supervisory" and "teaching" principals during the survey years. (See p. 14 for an explanation of these definitions.) The difference in the proportion of time given to "Other Functions" in 1958 as compared with 1968 may possibly be explained by the somewhat different terminology used in the two surveys.

Project ROME (n.d.) conducted a time-motion study of principals in Thomas County, Georgia to check the usefulness of the seven RCCM functional areas of responsibility as a category scheme for assessing principals' behavioral competencies. Subjects participating in the study were three elementary, two middle and one high school principal. Data were collected through direct observation of the principals within the context in which they routinely worked. Relative to the total week sampled, the principals spent 2% of their time in curriculum and instruction;

18% in staff personnel; 21% in student personnel; 16% in support management; 8% in school-community interface, 2% in fiscal management; 7% in system-wide policies and operations; and a total of 25% of their time in miscellaneous and unclassified activities. The large amounts of time recorded by the observers in the areas of student personnel, staff personnel and support management was a relatively consistent finding across the various schools.

Are principals decreasing their emphasis on instructional program leadership and increasing the time and attention they give to managerial tasks? The differences between the percentage of time devoted by the principals of the present study to instructional program leadership (recorded as "Curriculum and Instruction," "Staff Personnel," "Student Personnel") and the 1968 DESP study (recorded as "Supervision" and "Teaching") and the Project ROME study (recorded as "Curriculum and Instruction," "Staff Personnel," "Student Personnel") will be examined for statistical significance at the .05 level using a t-test (Glass and Stanley, 1970, p. 293).

With reference to the principals' time sampled, it is important to point out that the findings of the present study may be indicative of trends and not conclusive statements of fact. Only three days within a given month will be sampled. Thus details are far from complete. To illustrate, the workload is not the same all year round. School closing activities in June, for example, involve far more office work than usual: inventories, registers, attendance reports, evaluations of the year's work, etc. Similarly, weather-related activities in February may entail more attention to transportation problems than usual. More conclusive and

definitive statements could be based upon larger groups of principals, from all sections of the country and many more days, possibly distributed over a wider span of time, need to be sampled.

Nevertheless, a finding revealing a significant difference in the distribution of the principals' time among the various categories may indicate that some changes are being made in the character of the principalship. If a significantly greater proportion of the principals' time is being devoted to management functions, it may result from the societal and organizational factors delineated earlier in this paper. The design of this study, however, precludes any causal relationships from being inferred. A significantly greater proportion of time devoted to instructional leadership clearly represents a gain. This may result from attempts by principals to conform with present day educational theorists (Harris 1975; Elliot and Sergiovonni 1975) who have advocated a change in this direction. A finding of no difference may be interpreted as corroborating the reflections of several writers (Barth 1972; Goodlad and Klein 1970; Sarason 1971) who have commented on the chronic failure to effect any change in the schools. Apparently, there has been no improvement during the past decade in redistributing the principals' time towards the direction of greater instructional leadership.

Certain recommendations for practice should derive from this study. Each principal surveyed will be presented with a comparative breakdown of his actual as opposed to ideal distribution of time. By sampling the principals' estimates of their ideal time dimensions, we have obtained an indication of what the principals think they ought to be doing. They might do well to study the findings in the light of their own impressions

and try to reach agreement on changes, if any, they might deem to be desirable. They could be helped to find time for the most important areas, thus curtailing the impediments to an ideal time allotment. Understanding that ideal time allotment can become a reality, attained by their own efforts, is perhaps a first stop towards the realization of greater instructional leadership. A principal should shape the job; the job should not shape the principal.

References

Association of California School Administrators. Changing Role of the Principal. Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Document No. 010 593.

Barth, R. Open Education and the American School. New York: Agathon Press, 1972.

Bogue, E. G. "The Context of Organizational Behavior: A Conceptual Synthesis for the Educational Administrator." Educational Administration Quarterly 5, no. 2 (1969): 58-75.

Booth, A. Bisztray, G. "Value Orientations, Member Integration and Participation in Voluntary Association Activities." Adminstrative Science Quarterly 15, no. 1 (1970): 39-55.

Breenbough, R. B. "Hierarchical Role Immediacy and Subordinate Control Orientation: Notes Toward a Theory." The Journal of Educational Administration 7, no. 2 (1969): 160-171.

Campbell, R., Cunningham, L. and McPhee, R. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1965.

Coleman, P. "The Future Role of the School Administrator." Interchange 3, no. 4 (1972): 53-64.

Department of Elementary School Principals. The Elementary School Principalship. Washington, D. C.:National Education Association, 1928, 1948, 1958, 1968.

Elliot, D. and Sergiovanni, T. Educational and Organizational Leadership in Elementary Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Georgia State Department of Education, Atlanta and University of Georgia (College of Education), Athens. Results Oriented Management in Education: Project ROME. Identification and Development of Competencies of Building Level Administrators of Thomas County, Georgia: A Project Report and Appendices. Urbana, Ill: ERIC Document No. 105 558.

Glass, B. and Stanley, J. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Goodlad, J.and Klein, M. Behind the Classroom Door. Worthington, Ohio: C. A. Jones, 1970.

Harris, B. Supervisory Behavior in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Houts, P. "The Changing Role of the Elementary School Principal: Report of a Conference." National Elementary Principal 55, no. 2 (1975): 62-73.

Mazzarella, J. "The Principal's Role in Instructional Planning." School Leadership Digest, Second Series, No. 8, Arlington, Va.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1976.

McNally, H. "Summing Up. Chautauqua 1974: The Remaking of the Principalship." National Elementary Principal 54, no.1 (1974): 6-17.

Myers, D. "The Chautauqua Papers: A Dissent." National Elementary Principal 54, no. 1 (1974): 18-26.

Sarason, S. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

USOE. A Profile of Innovative School Systems. Technical Report No. 172. Madison: University of Wisconsin Center for Cognitive Learning, 1971.

Wiggins, T. "Behavioral Characteristics of School Principals." Education 93, no. 1 (1972): 36-38.

APPENDIX

Project ROME Functional Areas of Responsibility With Conceptual Examples of the Types of Activities Expected in Each Category

I. Curriculum and Instruction

reviewing new teaching aids, instructional materials, educational planning for students, developing school curriculum, instructional programs, teaching methods, testing programs, curriculum problems, scheduling and designing classroom environments to implement instruction, designing buildings

II. Staff Personnel

staff utilization, positions and job specifications, personnel information, employee benefits, professional problems, in-service workshops, staff recruitment, orientation programs for new staff members

III. Student Personnel

guidance services, pupil rights, pupil progress, student activities (extra-curricular and curricular), student personnel services, student grade placement policies, school rules, pupil orientation meetings for new students, student discipline

IV. Support Management

government agency guidelines in planning specifications, cafeteria school lunch program, scheduling of repair work, use of school property, training non-instructional personnel, registration and school calendar planning, transportation system, fire standards, distribution of supplies, emergency drills, auxiliary services, health services

V. School-Community Interface

school policy statements, designs plans to involve community, social conditions in relationship to student performance, community census in planning program and building needs, surveys and analysis to further educational goals, parent-teacher organizations, public relations, organizations of lay/professional community groups, adult education programs

VI. Fiscal Management

cost accounting system for repairs, tax structure documents, preparing budget, salary schedule committees, accounting for school funds, financial reports/statements, school insurance program, legal budget considerations, determination of budget considering district goals, staffing need projections

VII. System-Wide Policies and Operations

passing district referendums, board recommendations for educational goals and objectives, orientation of new board members, defining school policies in regard to board of education, recommendations to superintendent regarding new employees, utilization of district specialists to implement learner programs, attendance, teacher grievances to board, central office operations, decision-making, dismissal, tenure, transferring professional personnel within the system

PROJECT ROME
FUNCTIONAL AREA CATEGORY TITLES AS EXCERPTED
FROM THE 80 COMPETENCY STATEMENTS

CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION

1. Student interest and the design of curricula
2. Curriculum committees and the use of instructional materials
5. Student differences and the development of instructional materials
8. Teachers and the design of instructional evaluation methods
11. Standardized instruments and the evaluation of educational programs
12. Diagnostic and educational achievement testing program
13. Assessment of teaching method effectiveness
17. Staff organization and curriculum organization
19. Teacher instructional problem solving skills
20. Teacher evaluation of classroom instructional climate
24. Consistently failing students in regular classrooms and alternative educational plans
25. Student needs and curriculum design
26. External evaluation of school curricula and programs
27. Teachers and the design of classroom learning environments
28. Professional literature utilization and educational program design
30. Evaluation of student's progress toward instructional objectives
31. Teachers and student academic performance criteria
32. Parent, teacher, and student input and educational program design
37. Teacher input and the design of curricula
39. Modification of curriculum content and organization
44. Assessment of curriculum effectiveness

STAFF PERSONNEL

1. Lower staff decision-making and organizational responsibility
4. Observation of classroom teaching practices
5. Staff recognition and commendation of student accomplishments
13. Teacher understanding of students and student cumulative records
18. Teacher evaluation of school operations
19. Teacher use of instructional media
26. Staff participation in school policy decision-making
29. Staff and the interpretation of system decisions and priorities
42. Teacher and the development of instructional practices
45. Staff evaluation and in-service training
56. Staff salary schedule interpretation
61. Employee selection and employment guidelines
62. Teachers and student rights and responsibilities
69. Staff professional identification and development

PUPIL PERSONNEL

1. Parents, teachers, and counselors and the interpretation of student evaluation
2. Pupil personnel services and problems needing solution
3. Student activity program evaluation
7. Informal principal-student interaction
8. Professionally staffed student counseling program
9. Student follow-up information and pupil personnel services
10. Student attendance
14. Program for student's special needs and community service agencies
16. Effectiveness of pupil personnel services

17. Principal participation and attendance and school activities
18. Student accounting and attendance
19. Teachers and opportunities for student self-evaluation
20. Organization of pupil personnel services
22. Student cumulative records
23. Student information system and pupil personnel services
25. Student occupational and educational information and external sources
26. Commendation of student academic projects
29. Pupil and parent orientation to school
31. Principal involvement in student discipline

SUPPORT MANAGEMENT

8. School staff and information about legal mandates
31. Inspection of school plant facilities

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY INTERFACE

9. Communication with parents and local community

FISCAL MANAGEMENT

4. Required governmental financial reports
7. Financial resources and staffing needs
10. Recommendations for improvement of physical faciltiies
11. Budgetary limits and instructional materials and equipment
13. Legally required fiscal budgets
14. Authorized board of education budgets and the purchase of services and materials
18. Superintendent and fiscal audit information
19. Budgetary guidelines and school activities

23. School budget and legal requirements
27. Financial reports and legal guidelines
29. State Department of Education requirements, bookkeeping and accounting
30. Delegation of authority for internal accounting

SYSTEM-WIDE POLICIES AND OPERATIONS

3. Superintendent and school staff tenure/dismissal
4. Organization of school staff and system educational goals
7. Board of education recommendations and the revision of educational goals
8. Compatibility of systems and school goals and objectives
11. Staff decision-making responsibility
13. Superintendent and recommendations for physical facility improvement
19. System assigned subject matter specialists
21. Superintendent and recommendation concerning prospective school employees
27. School board policies and school personnel
28. Superintendent and planning system educational goals
32. Long range system planning and current school problems

PROJECT ROME
THE FINAL SET OF 80 VERIFIED PRINCIPAL COMPETENCY STATEMENTS

Curriculum/Instruction (21)*

1. Includes interests of students in designing new curriculum.

2. Establishes curriculum committees to plan for the use of instructional materials.

5. Considers individual differences between students when developing instructional procedures.

8. Includes teachers in designing methods for evaluating instruction.

11. Makes use of standardized instruments when evaluating the educational program.

12. Maintains an adequate achievement testing program for diagnostic and educational purposes.

13. Periodically assesses the effectiveness of teaching methods.

17. Plans curriculum schedules that reflect staff curriculum organization (e.g., time, place, subject matter, staff).

19. Assists teachers in developing skills related to solving instructional problems.

20. Works with teachers in evaluating the instructional climate in the classroom.

24. Identifies alternative educational plans for students consistently failing as a result of regular classroom instruction.

25. Designs a curriculum which meets individual learner needs.

26. Utilizes laymen and experts for evaluating the school curriculum and instructional program.

27. Works with teachers in designing classroom environments conducive to learning.

28. Utilizes research evidence in the professional literature when planning educational programs.

30. Establishes appropriate procedures for evaluating progress toward instructional objectives.

---

*Numbers in parentheses indicate total number of competencies in given functional area.

31. Plans student performance criteria in subject matter areas with teachers.

32. Includes parents, teachers, and students in planning educational programs.

37. Provides for teacher suggestions in designing new curricula.

39. Establishes procedures for modifying curriculum content and organization.

44. Assesses curriculum effectiveness.

Staff Personnel (14)

1. Assigns decision-making tasks to lower staff commensurate with their organizational responsibility.

4. Gathers information about teaching practices by observing teachers in classrooms.

5. Encourages staff to recognize and commend worthwhile accomplishments of students.

13. Plans to increase teachers' understanding of students by allowing teachers to review students' cumulative records.

18. Designs a system for involving teachers in evaluating the school's operation.

19. Trains teachers in the use of a variety of media (e.g., audio-visual equipment, library resources, etc.).

26. Invites staff participation in decision-making concerning school policies.

29. Interprets system decisions and priorities to the instructional and non-instructional staff.

42. Assists teachers in developing more effective practices for attaining instructional objectives.

45. Plans in-service training around the results of staff evaluation.

56. Interprets established salary schedules to staff.

61. Selects prospective employees according to established employment guidelines.

62. Advises teachers of individual student's rights and responsibilities.

69. Communicates to staff the importance of professional identification and development.

Student Personnel (19)

1. Plans conferences to interpret the professional evaluating of stuoents, to parents, teachers, counselors.

2. Prioritizes student personnel problems needing solution.

3. Evaluates student activities program.

7. Schedules times to be available for informal interaction.

8. Plans an adequate counseling program for students using school counselors and/or academic advisors.

9. Collects follow-up information on former students to improve student personnel services.

10. Implements a system to achieve regular attendance by students.

14. Uses available community service agencies in planning a program to meet children's special needs.

16. Evaluates the effectiveness of student personnel services.

17. Supports school activities program by active participation and attendance.

18. Maintains a system of child accounting and attendance.

19. Identifies ways in which teachers can provide students with opportunities for self-evaluation.

20. Organizes guidance and counseling services for students.

22. Maintains cumulative records on students.

23. Plans a student information record system as part of the school guidance.

25. Makes available to students occupational and educational information derived from community and professional sources.

26. Commends students who are involved in outstanding academic projects.

29. Plans pupil and parent orientation meetings for new students to familiarize them with schools.

31. Takes effective action on discipline matters requiring his intervention.

Support Management (2)

8. Informs staff of legal mandates that affect school operations.

31. Periodically inspects school plant facilities.

School-Community Interface (1)

9. Develops communication channels with parents and local community.

Fiscal Management (13)

4. Makes periodic financial reports as required by governmental agencies.

7. Projects staffing needs based on financial resources.

10. Makes recommendations for the improvement of physical facilities (e.g., classroom furnishings, building additions, grounds).

11. Makes decisions about instructional materials and equipment utilizing budgetary constraints.

13. Recommends financial budgets to local boards of education and other governmental agencies as required by law.

14. Purchases services and materials in accordance with the financial budget and with authorization of the board of education.

18. Provides superintendent with information needed for financial audits.

19. Uses budgetary guidelines to structure school activities.

23. Administers the school budget in accordance with legal requirements.

27. Prepares financial statements and reports as required to meet legal guidelines.

29. Maintains a bookkeeping and accounting system to meet State Department of Education requirements.

30. Delegates to appropriate persons responsibility to implement policies governing internal accounting.

System-Wide Policies and Operations (11)

3. Makes recommendations to superintendent concerning tenure or dismissal of staff members.

4. Organizes school staff in order to implement educational goals of the school system.

7. Utilizes board recommendations in revising educational plans.

8. Identifies program goals and objectives which are consistent with school district goals.

11. Clarifies decision-making responsibility to subordinates.

13. Makes recommendations to superintendent for the improvement of physical facilities (e.g., classroom furnishings, building additions, grounds).

19. Utilizes services of subject matter specialists assigned system-wide responsibilities.

21. Makes recommendations to superintendent concerning prospective employees.

27. Implements school board policies affecting school personnel.

28. Works with superintendent in planning district-wide educational goals.

32. Identifies existing problems in the school and relates to long range planning of the district.